## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

:

v. : Crim. No. 17-137

•

**RUFUS SETH WILLIAMS** 

ORDER

**AND NOW**, this 24th day of March, 2017, it is hereby **ORDERED** that insofar as Mr. Diamondstein's March 23, 2017 letter constitutes a request to withdraw, the request is **DENIED** as frivolous. Mr. Diamondstein remains as Defendant's counsel in this matter.

Mr. Diamondstein's Motion to Seal is **DENIED** as contrary to law. <u>See</u> U.S. Const. amend. I; <u>Press-Enterprise Co. v. Superior Court</u>, 478 U.S. 1, 10 (1986) ("First Amendment right of access to criminal trials . . . applies to preliminary hearings"); <u>United States v. Wecht</u>, 537 F.3d 222, 243 (3d Cir. 2008) (reversing decision to seal identities of jurors because District Court failed to articulate specific factual findings sufficient to overcome presumptive First Amendment right to access); <u>See also United States v. Wecht</u>, 484 F.3d 194, 207-08 (3d Cir. 2007) ("It is well-settled that there exists, in both criminal and civil cases, a common law public right of access to judicial proceedings and records." (quoting <u>Goldstein v. Forbes (In re Cendant Corp.)</u>, 260 F.3d 183, 192 (3d Cir. 2001))); <u>Leucadia, Inc. v. Applied Extrusion Techs., Inc.</u>, 998 F.2d 157, 164 (3d Cir. 1993) ("presumptive right of public access [attaches] to pretrial motions of a nondiscovery nature, whether preliminary or dispositive, and the material filed in connection therewith").

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Paul S. Diamond

Paul S. Diamond, J.